



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/767,072	01/30/2004	Juha A. Rasanen	0172.42472X00	6106
20457	7590	12/21/2004	EXAMINER	
ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP 1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET SUITE 1800 ARLINGTON, VA 22209-9889			MOORTHY, ARAVIND K	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2131		

DATE MAILED: 12/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/767,072	RASANEN, JUHA A.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Aravind K Moorthy	2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 April 2004.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 29 April 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-16 are pending in the application.
2. Claims 1-16 have been rejected.

Specification

3. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

The abstract exceeds the 150-word limit.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the

reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

4. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-10, 12-14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schuster et al U.S. Patent No. 6,446,127 B1.

As to claims 1, 9 and 13, Schuster et al discloses a Proxy Call State Control Function (P-CSCF) implemented in a mobile network to provide IP multimedia services comprising:

storing identification information from a given user equipment (UE) at registration in memory [column 11, lines 29-43];

receiving a SIP (Session Initiation Protocol) message from the given UE [column 12 lines 59 to column 13 line 2];

comparing identity in the SIP message with the identification information stored with a link to a Policy Decision Function (PDF) [column 13, lines 35-51]; and

using the same PDF for all operations of the given UE, when the identity in the SIP messages matches the identification information stored in memory [column 13, lines 35-51].

As to claims 2, 6, 10 and 14, Schuster et al discloses that the PDF is a separate entity from that of the P-CSCF [column 10, lines 11-24].

As to claims 4, 8, 12 and 16, Schuster et al discloses that the identification information of the given UE is obtained from the given UE during registration, and is linked with the PDF [column 13, lines 35-51].

As to claim 5, Schuster et al discloses an IP Multimedia Subsystem (IMS) architecture for IP multimedia services, comprising:

a given user equipment (UE) [column 10, lines 11-24];

a gateway support node (GGSN) configured to handle packet transmission to/from the given U [column 10, lines 11-24]; and

a proxy call session control function (P-CSCF) configured to serve as a first contact point of the UE and provide session management services, including establishing a packet data protocol (PDP) context for IMS related signaling, registration, and other procedures for IMS sessions [column 6, lines 42-61],

wherein said P-CSCF is further configured to perform the following:

storing identification information from the given UE during registration in memory, as discussed above;

receiving a SIP (Session Initiation Protocol) message from the given UE, as discussed above;

comparing identity in the SIP message with the identification information stored with a link to a Policy Decision Function (PDF), as discussed above; and

using the same PDF for all operations of the given UE, when the identity in the SIP messages matches the identification information stored in memory, as discussed above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 3, 7, 11 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schuster et al U.S. Patent No. 6,446,127 B1 as applied to claims 1, 5, 9 and 13 above, and further in view of Ejzak et al U.S. Patent No. 6,721,565 B1.

As to claims 3, 7, 11 and 15, Schuster et al does not teach that the PDF is configured to determine if one or more IP Multimedia subsystem (IMS) sessions in a PDP (Packet Data Protocol) context are modified. Schuster et al does not teach that when one or more IMS sessions in a PDP context are modified, send an aggregate authorization decision including both modified sessions and non-modified sessions per PDP context for policy enforcement.

Ejzak et al teaches a PDF that is configured to determine if one or more IP Multimedia subsystem (IMS) sessions in a PDP (Packet Data Protocol) context are modified [column 10 line 43 to column 11 line 5]. Ejzak et al teaches that when one or more IMS sessions in a PDP context are modified, send an aggregate authorization decision including both modified sessions and non-modified sessions per PDP context for policy enforcement modified [column 10 line 43 to column 11 line 5].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Schuster et al so that the PDF would have been configured to determine if one or more IP Multimedia subsystem (IMS) sessions in a PDP

(Packet Data Protocol) context were modified. If one or more IMS sessions in a PDP context were modified, an aggregate authorization decision would have been sent including both modified sessions and non-modified sessions per PDP context for policy enforcement.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Schuster et al by the teaching of Ejzak et al because it provides a method to ensure that packets have not been intercepted and modified by a third party [column 3, lines 24-34]

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aravind K Moorthy whose telephone number is 571-272-3793. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Aravind K Moorthy
December 13, 2004

AMZ131
12/16/04